

**APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JUNE 23, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance May 2010 - April 2011	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	P	1	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Phyllis Berry	P	1	1
James Brady	P	1	1
Ron Centamore	P	2	0
Mickey Hinton	P	1	1
Bradley Hubert	P	2	0
Doug Sterner	P	1	1
Alan Gabriel	A	1	1
Samuel Williams	P	1	0
Jessie Adderley	P	2	0
Steve Lucas	P	2	0
John Wilkes	P	1	1
Brice Lambrix	P	1	0

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
 Thomasina Turner Diggs, CRA
 Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
 Terry Burgess, Planning and Zoning
 Angela Wilson, CRA
 Greg Brewton, Director, Planning and Zoning
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m. by Vice Chair Phillips. As of this date there were fifteen appointed members to the Committee, which means eight would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

Chair Ferber welcomed Mr. Lambrix back to the Board, and told the newer members Mr. Lambrix served on the Board six years ago. Chair Ferber noted Mr. Lambrix was an architect and a property owner in Flagler Village.

II. Approval of December 16, 2009, April 28, 2010, and May 26, 2010 Minutes

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Brady, to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2009 meeting.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Brady, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2010 meeting.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Brady, seconded by Ms. Phillips, to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2010 meeting.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. Discussion Item – NPF CRA Parking Issues

Mr. Battle gave an update on the CRA parking issues, particularly as it relates to current and future area development. To provide background, Mr. Battle compared CRAs around the State, including Tampa, Jacksonville, Orlando, and Miami, stating many CRAs were a mix of downtown areas, neighborhoods, and commercial districts. Mr. Battle felt the Miami projects were the most similar to Fort Lauderdale in terms of how programs were created.

Mr. Battle noted a number of planning efforts since the 1980s, with a lot of discussion directed at parking issues. Mr. Battle brought up the following areas for discussion:

- The Sistrunk Corridor, from Andrews Avenue to the City limit of NW 24th Avenue, with the higher density areas located closer to Andrews Avenue, and more single tenant and smaller residential properties further away from Andrews Avenue. Mr. Battle felt the biggest opportunities for success were the nodes around 7th Avenue, 9th Avenue, and 15th Avenue. Mr. Battle noted the area was very close to existing mass transit lines that were heavily used by BCT and the downtown trolleys. Many customers in the area also walk to a variety of services already

located in the area. One opportunity would be to reduce the parking minimums required on a square footage basis. Another opportunity would be to build public parking placed at the eastern and the western end to provide additional parking.

- Part of Flagler Village, right off of Sistrunk and NE 6th Street, commonly referred to as FAT Village. Mr. Battle felt the proximity of the two areas created a good argument for working on both projects.

Mr. Battle noted the real estate market presented some unique challenges, and the new development pipeline was slowing up due to the dollars not being available to build projects. For those able to work on new developments, the parking would be a non-monetary incentive providing a “tremendous bang for our buck” in terms of encouraging both new development and the renovation of existing buildings.

Mr. Greg Brewton, Planning and Zoning Director, stated parking was an age old problem as it related to redevelopment along the Corridor, particularly along Sistrunk. Mr. Brewton stated he was open to improvement suggestions from the community.

Mr. Brewton noted a parking study was currently being done for the beach area, which might be the framework for changes to the entire city. In the downtown area the parking requirement was reduced based on public parking provided by the parking garages. Mr. Brewton felt the need now was for incentives to allow businesses to come in and thrive, and address some code amendments to reduce parking requirements, reduce change of use requirements, and things of that nature. .

Mr. Williams felt the whole idea was wonderful, as the parking was one of the biggest limiting factors for development. Mr. Williams suggested looking at the realities of a particular site in terms of the need for parking instead of the “cookie cutter” approach for the whole area. Mr. Brewton agreed, and stated the ongoing discussions included tailoring the parking to the usage and need of the area.

On page three of the provided materials, Mr. Lucas noted three potential options for consideration, and asked for additional detail on the options. Mr. Battle stated the potential options were related specifically to the Fat Village project, and were offered to solve a unique problem of the street not being linear. The potential options were:

- The creation of a distinct parking district for the area. The option may be appealing due to the de facto marketed ability as an arts and creative district.
- Exempting the parking requirement all together. The area borders the downtown CC, which does not have a parking requirement, therefore “extending the line” to

cover the area. This option may cause a “spill over” of parking in neighboring areas, and was still in discussion.

- Doing parking reductions as businesses come in and request them. This option was much more tedious administratively, as each business would have to apply separately.

Mr. Battle stated there was a very different approach on Sistrunk, mainly trying to look at how to encourage development to happen where the City thinks it should happen. Some of the previous options may apply, however, some other opportunities and examples may be better fits for the Sistrunk area.

In response to a question from Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Brewton stated the zoning on Sistrunk was primarily commercial. The CB zoning district was primarily created for commercial districts in close proximity to residential districts with the understanding that there would be some limitations.

Mr. Wilkes asked about the depth of the zoning along the Corridor, and Mr. Brewton stated about 120 feet. Mr. Battle explained the depth was more specific to the area west of 9th Avenue. Mr. Wilkes asked if a modification was being discussed allowing permission for ancillary use of parking for the front property, providing a transition from the CB to the residential zoning. Chair Ferber referred to the parking on Cheryl Dickey’s building, and asked if that would be an example of parking extending further than the 120 feet. Mr. Brewton explained the XP zoning, which allowed rezoning a portion of the adjoining property to XP, which was for parking only.

Following up, Mr. Wilkes asked about the option creating a distinct parking district and why the option was limited to just the FAT Village area. Mr. Battle was comfortable with the area as it was outlined a number of times, however was not opposed to increasing the area if necessary.

Mr. Lucas asked for clarification on the parking district concept. Mr. Battle explained it would be a new zoning district or an overlay. Conceptually, it would allow for all the current rights, plus some additional rights.

Mr. Hubert felt targeting a few locations, such as the 7th Avenue and Sistrunk area, and allow the suggestions to come from the developers and/or property owners. Mr. Williams suggested a collaborative effort between the developer and the City to bring some type of central parking strategically placed in some proximity to Fat Village and the Sistrunk Corridor.

Mr. Hinton pointed out new businesses were not the only possibility, and maybe the area did not need to be the main avenue for commercial business. Mr. Hinton, as a resident of the area, did not want more traffic and parking spaces. Mr. Hinton noted the area was already so narrow, and residents did not want to give up more to commercial zoning. Mr. Hinton did not feel Sistrunk would ever be a "big commercial spot", and felt what the area needed was things to create jobs. Chair Ferber pointed out the parking requirement reduction would make progress a little easier in the future for both commercial and residential development.

In response to a question from Chair Ferber, Mr. Battle confirmed the discussed parking reductions would add 91 spaces for on-street parking currently not in the area. Chair Ferber noted under the current law a city lot or on-street parking could be identified within 700 feet allowing a parking reduction. Mr. Brewton confirmed the request would be administrative through Planning and Zoning. Chair Ferber also noted Flagler allowed private property owners to count on-street parking toward their parking requirement, even if the spaces were in the public right-of-way. Mr. Brewton confirmed, and noted there were some improvements over the years, however the improvements did not provide enough incentive to bring in new development.

Referring back to Mr. Hinton's concerns, Mr. Brewton agreed the Sistrunk area should not be looked at for only large commercial buildings, but as an opportunity for mixed-use development in certain areas. Mr. Brewton acknowledged the community's frustration, however felt the additional allowances being discussed would be the impetus to spearhead new development.

Mr. Lucas asked about a timeframe for the project. Mr. Battle planned to ask the Board to allow an agenda item on the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, incorporating suggestions from the Board into the presentation.

IV. Discussion Item – NPF CRA Revenue Projections for Upcoming Fiscal Year

Mr. Battle provided a handout outlining the revenue projections for the upcoming fiscal year. Mr. Battle compared the analysis for the 2009 budget year to the 2010 revenue projection, and noted the CRA was down about \$1.3 million in revenue expected. Mr. Battle stated the trust fund, as of December, 2009, was approximately \$10.5 million. Moving forward, whatever was not spent on the operating budget, would be put into the fund to be used on projects.

Mr. Williams asked if there were minimums or maximums in project guidelines for any given year to reduce the rollover. Mr. Battle explained the budget process included discussions with the City's Budget Department regarding spending money correctly.

Chair Ferber reminded the Board of the importance of "landing the whale in the ship every time", whether the project is large or small. Chair Ferber felt the gradual work was essential, however, it was important to also continue to hunt for the larger projects.

V. Director's Report

Since the Board provided much of the funding for the real estate, Mr. Battle was pleased to announce the groundbreaking for Feldman park.

Mr. Battle provided the most recent DDA Quarterly Report, and pointed out the occupancy rates for downtown rental projects, with an overall rating of 80% occupancy. The three units in the CRA area were at 90%, 100%, and 100% occupied. The Eclipse opened in 2010 with price points similar to Dixie Court and financed with low income housing tax credits.

A flyer was provided letting the communities know about upcoming improvements in the Northwest Neighborhoods area, including Northwest Gardens IV.

The Northwest Commercial project was approved by the City Commission at the beginning of June, to include an amendment to the development agreement to allow the developer and Sav-A-Lot to move forward and develop the site. Many of the amendments discussed at the last meeting regarding bifurcating the project and putting it in phases were approved. Mr. Battle explained the developer planned to put a residential project on the block closest to the Longshoreman Hall, and the City Commission required an application by the end of the year for a low income housing tax credit through the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. The application was currently in the works.

Mr. Battle announced new projects awarded financing from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation included Kennedy Homes, and the Northwest Gardens III, including the three units near Sunland Park. These projects would increase the density by providing town homes and two and three story apartment buildings. Mr. Hinton asked if the town homes would be ownership or rental. Mr. Battle explained they would all be rentals, however they would be income restricted.

Mr. Hinton asked if the houses on the north side of 9th Street would have zoning changes. Mr. Battle confirmed the area was currently zoned for a park. Mr. Hinton expressed concern for the houses sitting adjacent to Lincoln Park School, and asked if the property could be sold to the school board. Mr. Hinton added that no

representatives had come to the Homeowner's Association to discuss the planned changes. Mr. Battle noted Mr. Hinton's concerns.

Mr. Battle stated Progresso Point, just north of Sistrunk and Andrews just north of the boat yard, would include 77 new units developed by Reliance Housing and Ellis. Mr. Battle confirmed the boat yard would remain in place.

Mr. Battle stated the County Commission passed a resolution accepting the City's finding to establish a new CRA, and the next step was working with the neighborhood on a plan. The plan would then be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Board and to the City Commission to accept the plan. The City Commission could then establish the trust fund. Only dollars generated in that area would go to that CRA, and would be a City-funded only CRA. Chair Ferber asked if issues would come to this Board. Mr. Battle felt another advisory board would be established, with no co-mingling of agendas or work.

Construction bids for the Sistrunk project were due June 30th, 2010. The Construction Manager process was completed and would be on the agenda for the City Commission's July 7, 2010 meeting to award the contract. Mr. Battle stated the pre-construction meeting was held on June 14, 2010 with approximately 25 people attending. The packages were made available and were now online.

VI. Old/New Business

Mr. Brady announced he would be termed off the Board, and was honored to serve with both past and current members. Chair Ferber felt Mr. Brady's input was invaluable throughout the years.

Mr. Battle passed out some pictures of a recently constructed Sav-A-Lot in Fort Pierce.

Chair Ferber asked for an update on the lighting project around Trammel Crow. Mr. Battle was not able to provide an update, and agreed to provide information later.

VII. Communication to the City Commission

None.

VIII. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights
Redevelopment Advisory Board
June 23, 2010
Page 8

[Minutes prepared by K. Bierbaum, Prototype, Inc.]